

Hall, followed by Senators Kristensen and Robinson.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President and members. Again, aren't we having that discussion right now? I mean can't we just vote down the committee amendments and, in effect, do exactly what we're talking about? I understand that the desire of the committee was to say let's have a discussion of this, but that's what I interpret the discussion of the committee amendments to be. My thought is is that what I understand you to say, Senator Bernard-Stevens, is that there is...it's not spelled out clearly enough what will...who will be employed, how many individuals, what the totality of the cost, I guess, is going to be for this operation. And I would agree, I'm not quite sure what that would take. And I'd be amenable to clarifying amendments to this language. I'm also, if it's cleaner to adopt the committee amendments, so be it. That's fine, then we'll come back and figure out specific language that does it, but I would be surprised if it doesn't mirror what's currently in the bill, or come very close. My other question is, why strike the E clause? Why take the emergency clause off? If the report has to be due back within a year of the adjournment of the Legislature, would be June of...first week of June of 1996. If you don't have the E clause on the proposal, and if it's got an A bill, it's not going to pass until the very end of the session, you're looking at 90 days down the road, in September some time, for purposes of getting started on this. You move it three months down the road, I mean you can do some planning and things of that kind, but I doubt that some could argue that you're in violation...you didn't have the legislative authority or statutory authority to begin the process if you don't put the E clause on it. And my thought is is that I would want to see that in there as well so you could begin this process as soon as possible, because it's going to be a very long, tedious and hard one to accomplish just on the timetable that you have built in place with one year. If you don't have the E clause you push it back 90 days, and I think you're tying the hands of those individuals who are on that commission who are trying to make recommendations back to this body. And I think that retaining that E clause would be a very wise move at this point. If it's cleaner, and I would not argue that it's probably not, to just adopt the committee amendments and then come back and deal with this on a piecemeal basis, fine. I'll be, I guess, very conciliatory this morning and say that's the way we ought to go about it. But I just question that we aren't going to come back to something very similar to the green copy